



Setti D. Warren  
Mayor

**City of Newton, Massachusetts**  
Department of Planning and Development  
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone  
(617) 796-1120  
Telefax  
(617) 796-1142  
TDD/TTY  
(617) 796-1089  
[www.newtonma.gov](http://www.newtonma.gov)

Candace Havens  
Director

---

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS  
CHESTNUT HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**DATE:** March 20, 2014

**PLACE/TIME:** City Hall, Room 202  
7:30 p.m.

**ATTENDING:** John Wyman, Chair  
Peter Vieira, Alternate  
Katy Holmes, Staff  
See Attendance List

Joyce Dostale, Member  
Samuel Perry, Alternate  
William Roesner, Member

**ABSENT:** Robert Imperato, Member

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with John Wyman presiding as Chair. Voting permanent members were Dostale and Roesner. Alternate members Vieira and Perry also voted. Katy Holmes acted as recording secretary and the meeting was digitally recorded.

**25 Old Orchard Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

Architect Dean Hofelich, LDa Architects, presented an application to replace gutters with a paintable fiberglass profile gutter that was custom molded by Plymouth Bay Fiberglass to match the existing. The architect also presented plans to install a panel of solid pane windows on the kitchen wall facing the driveway in keeping with similar windows on the same kitchen addition. Currently the wall is windowless.

**Materials Reviewed:**

*Photos*

*Elevations*

*Fiberglass gutter sample*

*Materials information*

Hofelich discussed the proposed design including the use of matching materials to the existing building and the minimal visibility of the proposed windows. Members asked questions about the

proposed gutter material and installation. Wyman motioned to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application as submitted Vieira seconded the motion and it passed 4 – 0, with Perry recusing himself as an abutter.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 20, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0, with one recusal:

**RESOLVED** to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 25 Old Orchard Road to approve the installation of custom fiberglass gutters made by Plymouth Bay Fiberglass and to approve installation of casement windows in the kitchen addition on wall overlooking the driveway to match existing.

Voting in the Affirmative:

John Wyman, Chair  
Joyce Dostale, Member  
Bill Roesner, Member  
Peter Vieira, Alternate

Recused as an Abutter:

Samuel Perry

**374 Hammond Street – Certificate of Appropriateness**

Attorney Steven Buchbinder presented an application on behalf of the owners Bruce MacDonald, Bligh MacDonald, and architect David de Sola to construct a new residence on this property. Demolition of the existing house was approved at a previous meeting (the house is still standing as of this writing). Buchbinder stated that the façade would be of brick with limestone trim, as the previous proposed limestone sheathing was thought to be too formal. He also emphasized that the placement of the house on the lot had much to do with the proximity of houses on either side to their lot lines.

As in previous hearings on this proposal, access to this lot from Hammond Street was further discussed, as was the length and width of the U-shaped driveway and its orientation in relation to the house. Commission members expressed concern that the garage door openings on this house would be the most visible feature, and that it was not in keeping with the church building across the street, setbacks in the neighborhood, or the neighboring historic district. Other members stated their preference for having the garage doors open to the rear of the lot, not the front. The Commission asked for a streetscape plan and also wanted to know the proposed square footage of the house. Members also stated their belief that the design of this proposed structure was not respectful to the architectural and siting elements in the neighborhood, and was too large for the lot. With the exception of the proposed sheathing on the building, plans submitted for this month's hearing did not represent any changes to what was previously submitted for review. Mr. Buchbinder told the Commission that his client would provide a plan showing the proposed footprint superimposed over the existing to help resolve siting problems raised by the Commission.

Buchbinder asked to continue the hearing to a future regularly scheduled meeting of this Commission, and said that the project could be made better. Mr. Buchbinder thanked the Commission for its suggestions and comments.

### **32 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness**

A representative from Grassi Design Group presented an application to add a decorative roof balustrade, which had been an original feature but was removed; install a new cast stone portico; replace the front door with a paired entrance with metal filigree gates; and install three new dormers over the portico, to be sheathed in brick

#### **Materials Reviewed:**

*Photos*

*Elevations*

*Materials information*

The architect discussed the proposed design including the use of matching materials to the existing building and the minimal visibility of the proposed project due to the setback of the building and the trees lining the long drive. Members asked questions about the proposed dormer and portico designs and discussed the historical merits (or not) of the proposed materials. The central portion of the building was described as the oldest, having been built in the 1920s and designed by Bigelow & Wadsworth in the Neo-Georgian Style. Commission members expressed concern about the appropriateness of using cast stone for the portico elements, including the balustrade above the door. The proposed balustrade on the roof was to be of a fiberboard composite, and Commission members were also concerned that two different materials would be used for the same architectural element. Double front doors on the central portion of the house also raised concerns as not being an appropriate element for a Georgian appearance. Commission members also stated their preference for slate to be used on the new dormers to match an existing dormer, rather than brick.

Wyman made a motion to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the new dormers to have slate sheathing, in place of the proposed brick. The Commission also recommended that the owners consider replicating the windows of the existing dormer to match those of the newly approved dormers. Vieira seconded the motion and it passed 5-0.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 20, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-0:

**RESOLVED** to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new dormers to have slate sheathing, in place of the proposed brick. The Commission also recommended that the owners consider replicating the windows of the existing dormer to match those of the newly approved dormers. Vieira seconded the motion and it passed 5-0.

#### **Voting in the Affirmative:**

John Wyman, Chair

Samuel Perry

Joyce Dostale, Member

Bill Roesner, Member

Peter Vieira, Alternate

Discussion ensued over the appropriateness of the portico and door treatments to the front façade. Commission members were concerned that the proposed metal filigree on the front doors was not a Georgian element, nor would it historically have been seen in a rural setting. In addition, the idea was offered that perhaps a single front door with sidelights would be a more appropriate alteration than installing two doors. Members also had concerns about the historic authenticity of using cast stone for the portico elements, and stated their preference for wood to match the proposed roof balustrade. The Commission asked that the architect provide more detail on how cast stone would be applied; to provide examples of other Georgian edifices that have cast stone porticos; proposing only one front door and not two; and perhaps considering stacking the dormers over the existing window fenestration rather than staggering them, to create a cleaner look. The application was continued until the next meeting.

#### **Administrative Discussion:**

##### Minutes

The Commission agreed to review paper copies of the December 2013 minutes at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.